This is a digitally signed Gazette, to verify click here.
http://rajpatrahimachal.nic.in

राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

बुधवार, 13 अगस्त, 2025 / 22 श्रावण, 1947

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

LABOUR EMPLOYMENT & OVERSEAS PLACEMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171 002, the 2nd July, 2025

No. LEP-E/1/2024 .—In exercise of the powers vested under section 17 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act,1947, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of

awards of the following cases announced by the **Presiding Judge, Labour Court**-cum-**Industrial Tribunal, Dharamshala, H.P.** on the website of the Printing & Stationery Department, Himachal Pradesh *i.e.* **"e-Gazette":—**

Sl. No	Case No	Petitioner	Respondent	Date of Award/ Orders
1.	App. 193/2022	Sh. Khem Raj	M/s Torrent Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	19-05-2025
2.	Ref. 05/2023	Sh. Jagdish Ram	M/s Torrent Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	19-05-2025
3.	Ref. 07/2023	Sh. Arjun Kumar	M/s Torrent Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	19-05-2025
4.	Ref. 122/2018	Sh. Sanjeev Kumar & Ors.	M/s Kanidhi Cosmecuticals Baddi	23-05-2025
5.	Ref.177/2018	Kamlesh Bhardwaj	M/s Apka Faisla Prakashan & Anr.	29-05-2025

By order,

Sd/-
(PRIYANKA BASU INGTY, IAS),
Secretary (Lab. Emp. & O.P.).

Khem Raj

Versus

The Occupier, FM. M/s Torrent Pharmaceuticals

App. 193/2022

File taken up today in view of order passed in application for prepontment.

19.05.2025
Present: Petitioner in person with Sh.Indresh Thakur, Ld. Csl. for the petitioner.

Sh. Rajeev Sharma, Ld. Csl. for the respondent.

Vide my separate orders passed in application No. 73/2025 for prepontment filed by the respondent to which the petitioner has also given his consent, this case is taken up today.

The petitioner has been identified before the court by Sh. Indresh Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner. Vide separate statement, the petitioner has stated that he has compromised the matter with the respondent company vide Ex. CA and as per the compromise, petitioner has received full and final payment of Rs. 3,00,000/- through cheque and now nothing survive in this claim/reference which may be decided accordingly.

Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties by way of amicable settlement Ex. CA and a sum of Rs. 3,00,000/- has been paid to the petitioner by the respondent through

cheque, and as such, nothing survive in this petition. Resultently, the present reference received from the appropriate government is answered accordingly. The statement of petitioner as well as settlement Ex. CA shall form part and parcel of this award. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced:
19.05.2025

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court, Shimla.

Jagdish Ram

Versus

The Occupier, FM. M/s Torrent Pharmaceuticals

Ref . No. 05/2023

File taken up today in view of order passed in application for prepontment.

19.05.2025
Present: Petitioner in person with Sh. Indresh Thakur, Ld. Csl. for the petitioner.

Sh. Rajeev Sharma, Ld. Csl. for the respondent.

Vide my separate orders passed in application No. 74/2025 for prepontment filed by the respondent to which the petitioner has also given his consent, this case is taken up today.

The petitioner has been identified before the court by Sh. Indresh Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner. Vide separate statement, the petitioner has stated that he has compromised the matter with the respondent company vide Ex. CA and as per the compromise, petitioner has received full and final payment of Rs. 3,00,000/- through cheque and now nothing survive in this claim/reference which may be decided accordingly.

Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties by way of amicable settlement Ex. CA and a sum of Rs. 3,00,000/- has been paid to the petitioner by the respondent through cheque, and as such, nothing survive in this petition. Resultently, the present reference received from the appropriate government is answered accordingly. The statement of petitioner as well as settlement Ex. CA shall form part and parcel of this award. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced:
19.05.2025

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court, Shimla.

Arjun Kumar

Versus

The Occupier, FM. M/s Torrent Pharmaceuticals

Ref. No. 07/2023

File taken up today in view of order passed in application for prepontment.

19.05.2025
Present: Petitioner in person with Sh. Indresh Thakur, Ld. Csl. for the petitioner.

Sh. Rajeev Sharma, Ld. Csl. for the respondent.

Vide my separate orders passed in application No. 75/2025 for prepontment filed by the respondent to which the petitioner has also given his consent, this case is taken up today.

The petitioner has been identified before the court by Sh. Indresh Thakur, Advocate for the petitioner. Vide separate statement, the petitioner has stated that he has compromised the matter with the respondent company vide Ex. CA and as per the compromise, petitioner has received full and final payment of Rs. 3,00,000/- through cheque and now nothing survive in this claim/reference which may be decided accordingly.

Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties by way of amicable settlement Ex. CA and a sum of Rs. 3,00,000/- has been paid to the petitioner by the respondent through cheque, and as such, nothing survive in this petition. Resultently, the present reference received from the appropriate government is answered accordingly. The statement of petitioner as well as settlement Ex. CA shall form part and parcel of this award. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced:
19.05.2025

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court, Shimla.

23.05.2025
Present: **Shri Sanjeev Kumar President of the workers union (petitioners) present in person who has been identified before me by Shri G.S. Rana, Advocate.**

Shri Rajeev Sharma, Advocate with Shri Mukesh Bhardwaj, AR for the respondent company.

This case has been taken up for proper order today.

At this stage a joint application has been moved by the parties for placing of original settlement(s) on record. It is averred in the application that the respondent has compromised the

matter with the petitioners out of Court and the settlement has been arrived between them as per Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The settlement is registered with Labour Inspector as per law and now the applicant/respondent wants to place the settlement on court file.

Shri Sanjeev Kumar, President of the workers union, has stated, on oath, that the workers/petitioners have settled the dispute with the respondent as per their free-will vide settlement(s) Ex. CA (92 pages) which have been signed by petitioners- workers separately. Now, nothing remains due to the petitioners from respondent company and the petitioner union does not want to proceed further with the case and the case may be dismissed accordingly.

In view the aforesaid statement of the President of workers union, the application filed by both the parties to place on record settlement, is allowed. Resultantly, settlement(s) Ex. CA (containing 92 pages) is ordered to be placed on record.

I am satisfied that as per settlement(s) Ex. CA, both the parties have amicably settled the dispute and now nothing survives in the present case. The reference petition received from the appropriate Government is answered accordingly. The statement of Shri Sanjeev Kumar, President of workers union as well as settlement(s) Ex. CA shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be communicated to the appropriate government for its publication in the official gazette. The application after completion and registration be tagged with the main case file and file, after completion be consigned to records.

Announced in the open Court today on this 23rd Day of May, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Industrial tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla (H.P.).
Camp at Nalagarh.

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
H.P. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-**LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference No. : 177 of 2018

Instituted on : 05.10.2018

Decided on : 29.05.2025

Kamlesh Bhardwaj s/o Shri Hem Singh r/o c/o Sharma Niwas, Madhuban Colony Hospital Road Solan Tehsil & District Solan, H.P. . . *Petitioner.*

Versus

1. M/s Aapka Faisla Prakashan Pvt. Ltd., Anand Complex, District Bureau Office, II Floor, Amar Complex, The Mall Solan, H.P.

2. M/s Aapka Faisla Prakashan Pvt. Ltd., Village Kohli, P.O Bohri, NH-88, Hamirpur, District Hamirpur, H.P. . . *Respondents.*

Reference under Section 17(2) of the Working Journalists and other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of Services and Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1955.

For the petitioner : Sh. Prateek Kumar, Advocate

For the respondent : Sh. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate

AWARD

The Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer, Solan Zone Solan has made the following reference to this Court after failure of the conciliation proceedings:

"**Whether non-payment of wages as per recommendations of Majitha Wage Board constituted under Section 9 of the Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Condition of Services and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955) vide notification by the Centre Government to Shri Kamlesh Bhardwaj (an employee) by the management/employer of the M/s Aapka Faisla Prakashan Pvt. Ltd., Village Kohli, P.O Bohri, NH-88, Hamirpur and is legal and M/s Aapka Faisla Prakashan Pvt. Ltd., Anand Complex, District Bureau Office, II Floor, Amar Complex, Near Hanuman Mandir, The Mall Solan, H.P is legal and justified? If not, what amount of arrear of unpaid wages or claim and interest, compensation or any other relief the above worker is entitled to from the management?"**

2. The case as emerges from the statement of claim is that petitioner had joined as Photo Editor in category-1, HQ Shimla with the respondent no.1 newspaper establishment, after fulfilling all the requirements of the respondents. Proper interview was conducted by the respondents and ultimately the petitioner was selected as Photo Editor on monthly salary of ₹ 3500/-. The salary to petitioner was paid to him in cash till the date of his illegal oral termination. Respondent no.1 newspaper establishment has an average sale of 74,900 copies per day @ ₹ 3/- per copy and having a business of advertisement of ₹ 26,91,842/- from DAVP and in coratio approximately over ` three crores business of advertisement and other sources enabling class of newspaper establishment under category-V *i.e* ₹ ten crore and above, but less than 50 crore *w.e.f.* 10.08.2010 in accordance to the classification made under the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board. The petitioner worked as Photo Editor with the respondents till 01.12.2016 and thereafter his services were orally terminated without following the mandatory provisions of law. Petitioner was paid a meager salary of ₹ 3500/- per month upon which he worked till the date of his illegal oral termination. Petitioner was not paid as per the recommendations of Majitha Wage Board which is binding upon the respondent newspaper establishment. Petitioner was the permanent employee of the respondents which fact can be verified from attendance register maintained by the respondents and identity card issued by the respondent in the name of the petitioner. The work of the petitioner was to edit the photographs collected by the news agents of the newspaper before they could be published in the newspaper. As per the recommendation of Majitha Wage Board, the petitioner falls in schedule 1-A in category of group-3. The petitioner time and again requested the respondent newspaper establishment to implement the recommendations of Majitha Wage Board in a strict sense and to pay arrears of salary to him, which he was entitled to receive, but the respondents refused to make the payment. As per the table-I of the wages, the respondents falls in category-1 and the petitioner falls in group-3 as such the respondents are liable to pay ₹ 11,99,960/- to the petitioner as per the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board. The petitioner had worked with utmost honesty and

dedication and his work was always appreciated by the officials of the respondents and nothing contrary was ever conveyed to him uptill his illegal termination. The services of the petitioner were illegally terminated in violation of the provisions of Sections 25-F, 25-G and 25-H of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 despite the fact that petitioner has completed 240 days in each calendar year. The petitioner was ultimately forced to give legal notice to the respondents on 04.12.2016 against his oral termination. The conciliation proceedings were held before the Conciliation Officer, but due to adamant attitude of the respondents, conciliation failed and reference was finally sent to this Court for adjudication. The petitioner has averred that the respondents have retained his juniors and have violated the principles of "last come first go". Apart from this, the petitioner has averred that he is unemployed since 01.12.2016 as such he is entitled for the salary as per the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board *w.e.f.* November, 2011 till the date of his re-engagement. The petitioner has prayed that the respondents be directed to pay the differential wage amount of ₹ 11,99,960/- along-with all the consequential service benefits including full back-wages *w.e.f.* 01.12.2016 till his re-engagement. The petitioner has also prayed for litigation cost of ₹ 25000/-.

3. Notice of this claim was sent to the respondents in pursuance thereof the respondents contested the claim by filing reply. Apart from taking preliminary objections of maintainability and that the petitioner never completed 240 days in a calendar year with the respondents, it was also averred that the petitioner has not come to the Court with clean hands and has suppressed the material facts from this Court and that this Court has no jurisdiction to try and entertain the present petition. On merits, it was denied that the petitioner joined as Photo Editor in category-I HQ Solan. It was averred that the petitioner was employed as Photo Editor on part time basis *w.e.f.* 10.08.2010 and since he was part time employee, his services were never terminated by the respondents rather he himself had voluntarily abandoned the employment. It is denied that the respondents have an average sale of 74,900 copies per day and having approximately business of ` three crores. It is also disputed that the respondents newspaper falls under the category-V of the classification made under the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board. It is denied that the petitioner had worked as Photo Editor with the respondents till 01.12.2016 and claimed that he was employed as part time Photo Editor *w.e.f.* 10.08.2010 and he voluntarily left the job and he never issued any notice to the respondent qua abandonment of his job. It was disputed that the petitioner is entitled for benefits under the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board and it was further disputed that he is entitled to claim ₹ 11,99,960/- from the respondents. Respondents denied any violation of Sections 25-F, 25-G and 25-H of the Industrial Disputes Act and it was claimed that the petitioner never completed 240 days in each calendar year as such the principles of "last come first go" do not apply to the case in hand and prayed for the dismissal of the claim.

4. Petitioner filed rejoinder in which he denied preliminary objections raised by the respondent and also denied the averments as made in the reply and reaffirmed those as made in the statement of claim.

5. On the pleadings, this Court formulated the following issues on 04.03.2021:—

1. Whether the non-payment of wages to the petitioner as per the recommendations of Majitha Wage Board is illegal, arbitrary and violative of the I.D. Act and the recommendations of Majitha Wage Board as alleged? If so, what relief the petitioner is entitled to including the difference in wages amount of ` 11,99,960/- as claimed? If so to what relief the petitioner is entitled to? . . *OPP*.

2. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable as the petitioner has not approached this Court with free hands, as alleged? If so, its effect thereto ? . . *OPR*.

3. Whether the petition is bad for want of jurisdiction as alleged? If so, its effect thereto? . . *OPR*.

4. Whether the petition is not maintainable as the petitioner is stopped from filing the present claim on account of his own acts, deeds and acquiescence, as alleged? If so, its effect thereto? . . *OPR*.

5. Relief

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed. Petitioner appeared in the witness box as PW-1 whereas Shri Devidnder Sharma, Special Correspondent of respondents appeared as RW-1.

7. I have heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties and gone through the records of the case carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

Issue No. 1 : No. Not entitled to any relief.

Issue No. 2 : Yes

Issue No. 3 : Yes

Issue No. 4 : No

Relief : Reference is answered in Negative as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

Issues No.1 to 3 :

9. All these issues are intermingled and inter-connected and require common appreciation of the evidence, as such all these issues are taken up together for the purpose of determination.

10. So far as issue no.1 is concerned, same is most contentious issue between the parties.

11. Onus to prove issue no.1 is on the petitioner.

12. The claim of the petitioner is based upon the fact that Central Government constituted Majithia Wage Board for revision of wages of newspaper establishments and the Majithia Wage Board recommended revision in wages on 01.07.2010. The said recommendations were accepted by the Central Government vide notification dated 11.11.2011. The recommendations of the Majithia Wage Board were notified by the Government, which were challenged by the various newspaper agencies before the Hon'ble Apex Court, however, the Hon'ble Apex Court has upheld the recommendations of the Majithia Board.

13. Before proceeding further, it would be appropriate to first discuss the evidence which is on record.

14. To prove his case, the petitioner stepped into the witness box as PW-1 and led his evidence by way of affidavit PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the petition. He also placed on record the copy of identity card Ex. P-1, copy of salary slips Ex. P-2 to Ex. P-4 copy of calculation sheet Ex. P-5, copy of appointment letter Ex. P-6, cutting of newspapers Mark PX-1 to Mark PX-6 and copy of attendance register Mark PX-7 to Mark PX-11.

15. During cross-examination, he denied that he was engaged on part time basis as photographer by the respondents. He deposed that he has not produced the appointment letter issued in the year 2010. He admitted that he had not brought the original of Ex. P-6 in the Court. He admitted that he was shown as part time employee in Ex. P-6. He further admitted that his wife is running a photo studio at Solan. He denied that he had abandoned the job to help his wife in the photo studio. He stated that he has not produced the attendance record.

16. This is the entire evidence which has been led by the petitioner.

17. In order to rebut the case of the petitioner, respondents examined Shri Devender Sharma, Special Correspondent as RW-1, who also tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. RW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the reply. He also placed on record authority letter Ex. R-1.

18. During cross-examination, he deposed that he is working with the respondent since 2013. He admitted that the petitioner was engaged by the respondent in 2010 on monthly salary of ₹ 3500/-. He denied that the petitioner was engaged as Photo Editor. He admitted that ID cards Ex. P-1 were issued by the respondent in the name of the petitioner. He denied that ID card proofs were issued only to the regular employees. He admitted that receipts Ex. P-2 to Ex. P-4 were issued by the respondents. He admitted that news items Mark PX-1 to Mark Px-6 bears the name of the petitioner. He further admitted that the petitioner marked his presence in the attendance register as per Mark PX-7 to Mark PX-11. He denied that the petitioner had completed 240 days in a calendar year. He admitted that no notice or letter was issued to the petitioner to resume his duties.

19. This is the entire evidence which has been led by the respondent in the present case.

20. So far as the claim of the petitioner is concerned though the claim of the petitioner is based on the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board and on notification dated 11.11.2011 but while leading evidence the petitioner has not produced any document to establish that the respondent management was having gross revenue of more than ` 10 crores and above but less than 50 *w.e.f.* 10.08.2010 as claimed by the petitioner. No document in this regard has been produced on record nor any suggestion has been put to the witness of the respondent that the average revenue of the respondent/management is more than ₹10 crores but less than 50 crores. The petitioner though has claimed that he was working as photo editor on regular basis with the respondent, however, no appointment letter in this behalf was produced. The petitioner has claimed that respondents falls in category-V as per the recommendations of the Majithia Wage Board and he falls in group-3, but he has not produced any proof to that effect. In the absence of any such documentary proof, it is difficult for this Court to fix the petitioner and respondent in any of the categories as recommended by the Majithia Wage Board.

21. Apart from this, it is an admitted fact that the petitioner has worked with the respondent till December, 2016 and has made this claim after much delay of publication of notification dated 11.11.2011. At the time when the petitioner had moved application before the Labour Officer, in the year 2018, there was no relationship of employer and employee between the parties. The **Hon'ble High Court of Punjab & Haryana** in case titled as Canara Bank Vs. Presiding Officer, Central (1994) 106 PLR 375 has held as under:

8. In the case in hand, it is not disputed that the workman had submitted his resignation and once the management claims that the resignation become effective whereby the relationship of master and servant had come to an end, it was not open to the Labour Court to proceed on the basis that it continued to exist and compute the monetary benefits that may be due to him. Workman's own case is that he was not allowed to join duty and the justification shown by the management in not permitting to do so was that his resignation had become effective as he had acted upon the same."

Since, the petitioner has admitted that he had worked with the respondent till December, 2016, much before raising this claim and after the cessation of employment, the petitioner who was not in relationship of master and servant with the respondent cannot agitate that he was entitled to enhanced salary as per recommendations of Majithia Wage Board.

22. The other point which was raised in this reference by the respondent is that the provisions of Section 17(2) of the Act are similar to the provisions of Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The powers under section 33-C(2) of the I.D Act confined on the Labour Court are that of executing Court as such the petitioner could not raise any dispute under Section 17(2) of the Act which was not pre-adjudicated or predetermined. The petitioner has raised the claim for difference in pay as per the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board. The reference has been made to this Court under Section 17(2) of the Act. Section 17of the Act reads as under:

"17. Recovery of money due from an employer. –

(1) **Where any amount is due under this Act to a newspaper employee from an employer, the newspaper employee himself, or any person authorized by him in writing in this behalf or in case of the death of the employee, any member of his family may, without prejudice to any other mode of recovery, make an application to the State Government for the recovery of the amount due to him and if the State Government or such authority as the State Government may specify in this behalf, is satisfied that any amount is so die, it shall issue a certificate for that amount to the Collector, and the Collector or shall proceed to recover that amount in the same manner as an arrear of land revenue.**

(2) If any question arises as to the amount due under this Act to a newspaper employee from his employer, the State Government may, on its own motion or upon application made to it, refer the question to any Labour Court constituted by it under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), or under any corresponding law relating to investigation and settlement of Industrial disputes in force in the State and the said Act or law shall have effect in relation to the Labour Court as if question so referred were a matter referred to the Labour Court for the adjudication under that Act or law.

(3) …….

23. The Hon'ble High Court of Judicature of Madras in **WP No. 6343 of 2022 dated 15.04.2022 case titled as S. Madhavan Vs. M/s THG Publishing Pvt. Ltd. (formerly M/s Kasturi & Sons Ltd.) 859 and 860 Anna Salai Chennai-6000002** has dealt with the similar matter. The Hon'ble high Court of Madras has considered the scope of Section 17(2) of the Act and held as under:

"10. **It is not disputed that the claim of the petitioner for difference in Dearness Allowance for the period 11.11.2011 is based on the Award of the Majithia Wage Board, which was approved by the Government of India on 11.11.2011 and confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in W.P. (Civil) No.246 of 2011 on 07.02.2014. The petitioner's raised a dispute claiming difference in Dearness allowance and the same was referred to the Labour Court by the Government of Tamil Nadu in G.O.(ID) 441 dated 21.07.2016 under Section 17 (2) of the Working Journalist and other Newspaper Employees (conditions of service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1955. During the pendency of the said reference in the present 205/2011 the petitioner's were retrenched and hence the complaint under Section 33(1) (a) of the I.D. Act was filed. Let me now refer to the provisions of the Working Journalist Act as well as the ID Act which are relevant for the purpose of this case. Section 2(K) of the ID Act reads as follows:**

"2(k)" industrial dispute" means any dispute or difference between employers and employers, or between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment or the terms of employment or with the conditions of labour, of any person; "

Section 17(2) of the Working Journalist Act which reads as follows:

"17(2) If any question arises as to the amount due under this Act to a newspaper employee from his employer, the State Government may, on its own motion or upon application made to it, refer the question to any Labour Court constituted by it under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), or under any corresponding law relating to investigation and settlement of industrial disputes in force in the State and the said Act or law shall have effect in relation to the Labour Court as if the question so referred were a matter referred to the Labour Court for adjudication under that Act or law."

11. **The reading of Section 17(2), particularly the phrase "as if the question so referred were a matter referred to the Labour Court for adjudication under that Act or law", in my view cannot convert the question into a dispute as defined and understood under Section 2(K) of the I.D. Act. The words, as if the question so referred were a matter referred to the Labour Court for adjudication under the act or law" would only mean that while answering the question the Labour Court would adjudicate it in the same manner as it would adjudicate a reference under the I.D. Act. To say that the reference of the question to the Labour Court changes the character of the reference into an industrial dispute goes against the letter and spirit of the said provision. The legislature has used the term "refer the question". The legislature has consciously avoided the term 'dispute', because the legislature was aware that the term 'dispute' has its own connotations under the I.D Act. From a reading of the definition of Industrial Dispute under Section 2(k), it is clear that the question that is referred under Section 17(2) cannot be construed as an industrial dispute. An industrial dispute referred to therein is in relation to non employment, the terms of employment or conditions of labour. Whereas the question under Section 17(2) relates to computation of claim and hence, it would not fall under the definition of industrial dispute under the ID Act.**

12. **As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the respondent Section 17 of the Working Journalist Act is akin to Section 33(C) (2) of the I.D Act. It is well settled**

by catena of Judgments of this Court as well as Hon'ble Supreme Court that the jurisdiction exercised by the Labour Court under Section 33(C)(2) is that of an Executing Court. In the present case, it is seen that the recommendations of the Majithia Wage Board were accepted by the Government of India on 11.11.2011 and the same was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which confirmed the recommendations of the Majithia Wage Board, but with modification that the same would be effective from 11.11.2011 only.

13. It is the respondents' case that the respondent had paid the dues to the petitioner and other employees as per the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2014-2015 itself, but the petitioner claimed higher Dearness Allowance and therefore petitioned the Government under the Working Journalist Act. The Government in terms of Section 17 of the Working Journalist Act referred the claim petition to the Principal Labour Court. The aforesaid facts clearly establish that the question referred to was a claim relating to the computation of difference in the Dearness Allowance paid by the respondent to the petitioner. In my view, the question referred to the Labour Court on the basis of the Majithia Wage Board recommendations relates to computation of Dearness Allowance under Section 17(2) of the Working Journalist Act and hence not an industrial dispute as defined in the Industrial Disputes Act. I am fortified in my view by the Judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of the Gujarat High Court in Keshavlal M.Rao Vs. State of Gujarat and Others reported in 1993 (1) LLN 373. The Hon'ble Chief Justice, S.Nainar Sundaram, J. while considering similar issue held as follows:

> **"Section 17 to a very great extent by verbalism and by implications stands in pari materia with Section 33C of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Section 33C(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is comparable with Section 17(1) of the Act; and Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is comparable with Section 17(2) of the Act. The scope of Section 33C of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 has come up for consideration by pronouncements not only at the level of the High Courts but also at the level of the Apex Court of the land. They are incisive and they have, without any ambiguity characterized the machinery under Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as one relatable to execution stage and not at the adjudicatory level over the right to relief claimed by applicant and denied by the opponent. They have held that investigation into and determination of any dispute regarding the applicant's right to relief and the corresponding liability of the opponent will be outside the scope of the said provision. The set of expression found in Section 33C (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is "If any question arises as to the amount of money due", from the employer to the workman. As already noted, the set of expressions used in Section 17(2) of the Act is "If any question arises as to the amount due under this Act to a newspaper employee from his employer". Under Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the specified Labour Court decides that question. Under Section 17(2) of the Act, the question gets referred to the Labour Court for its decision over it. The similar features between the two provisions are very portent and on the basic factor that the provisions are in pari materia, there is every warrant for applying the ratio of the judicial pronouncements delineating the scope of Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to delineate the scope of Section 17(2) of the Act."**

24. Since, it has been held by the Hon'ble High Court of Madras that the provisions of Section 17(2) of the Act are akin to the provisions of Section 33-C(2) of the Act and such

proceedings under Section 33-C(2) are summery in nature. Thus, the pronouncement delineating the scope of Section 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 would also be helpful for disposal of this case. The Hon'ble Apex Court in case titled as **Municipal Corporation of Delhi Vs. Razak (1995 SCC 1- 235)** has held as under:

> "**Dispute relating to entitlement is not incidental to the benefit claimed and is, therefore, clearly outside the scope of a proceeding under** Section 33-**C(2) of the Act. The Labour Court has no jurisdiction to first decide the workmen's entitlement and then proceed to compute the benefit so adjudicated on that basis in exercise of its power under** Section 33-C(2) **of the Act. It is only when the entitlement has been earlier adjudicated or recognized by tile employer and thereafter for the purpose of implementation or enforcement thereof some ambiguity requires interpretation that the interpretation is treated as incidental to the Labour Court's power under** Section 33-**C(2) like that of the Executing Court's power to interpret the decree for the purpose of its execution**".

25. Similar is the judgment(s) of Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **2006 (109) FLR 530 case titled as Union of India and another Vs. Kankuben (dead) by LRs. and others** and **Bombay Chemical Industries Vs. Deputy Labour Commissioner and Anr., 2022 Live Law (SC) 130**.

26. In view of the discussion made hereinabove, it is amply clear that the jurisdiction of Labour Court under Section 17(2) of the Act is limited to the computation of amount due and it cannot decide the dispute as to the entitlement of the petitioner to be fixed in a particular group or to determine that for what salary he is entitled to under the recommendations of Majithia Wage Board. In **Navbharat Press Employees union, Mafatlal Employees Union Vs. State of Maharashtra, Labour Industries and Energy Department and Ors., 2009 (III) Bom LR 4347**, the double bench of Hon'ble High Court of Bombay has held that the question as to which class the petitioner falls involves detailed investigation as regard gross revenue of respondent establishment, therefore, the same cannot be termed as mere implementation or execution of the Manisana Award. The relevant para of the aforesaid judgment is as under:

> "15. **The dispute in this case is as regards entitlement of the members of the petitioner union to higher watges on the basis that respondent 5 falls in class II and not in class IV of clause 6 of the Manisana Award and, therefore, the basic question which has to be decided is as to in which class respondent 5 falls. That would involve a detailed investigation as regards gross revenue of respondent 5. For that purpose, various documents including the balance sheet of respondent 5 will have to be gone into. Therefore, this is not a mere implementation or execution of the said Manisana Award**."

27. The Hon'ble Apex Court in case titled as **Kasturi and Sons Private Ltd., Vs. N. Salivateswaran and another AIR 1958 507**, has held that the enquiry contemplated under Section 17 of the Act is a summary enquiry of a very limited nature and its scope is confined to the investigation of the narrow point as to what amount is actually due to be paid to the employee under the decree and award. The relevant paras of the aforesaid judgment are reproduced as under:

> "8**. It is significant that the State Government or the specific authority mentioned in** s. 17 **has not been clothed with the normal powers of a court or a tribunal to hold a formal enquiry. It is true that** s. 3**, sub-s. (1) of the Act provides for the application of the** Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**, to or in relation to working journalists subject to sub-s. (2); but this provision is in substance intended to**

make working journalists workmen within the meaning of the main Industrial Disputes Act**. This section cannot be read as conferring on the State Government or the specified authority mentioned under** s. 17 **power to enforce attendance of witnesses, examine them on oath, issue commission or pass orders in respect of discovery and inspection such as can be passed by the boards, courts or tribunals under the** Industrial Disputes Act**. It is obvious that the relevant provisions of s. 11 of the** Industrial Disputes Act, 1947**, which confer the said powers on the conciliation officers, boards, courts and tribunals cannot be made applicable to the State Government or the specified authority mentioned, under** s. 17 **merely by virtue of** s. 3(1) **of the act.**

9. In this connection, it would be relevant to remember that s. 11 **of the act expressly confers the material powers on the Wage Board established under** s. 8 **of the Act. Whatever may be the true nature or character of the Wage Board-whether it is a legislative or an administrative body-the legislature has taken the precaution to enact the enabling provisions of** s. 11 **in the matter of the said material powers. It is well known that, whenever the legislature wants to confer upon any specified authority powers of a civil court in the matter of holding enquiries, specific provision is made in that behalf, if the legislature had intended that the enquiry authorized under** s. 17 **should include within its compass the examination of the merits of the employee's claim against his employer and a decision on it, the legislature would undoubtedly have made an appropriate provision conferring on the State Government or the specified authority the relevant powers essential for the purpose of effectively holding such an enquiry. The fact that the legislature has enacted** s. 11 **in regard to the Wage Board but has not made any corresponding provision in regard to the State Government or the specified authority under s. 17 lends strong corroboration to the view that the enquiry contemplated by** s. 17 **is a summary enquiry of a very limited nature and its scope is confined to the investigation of the narrow point as to what amount is actually due to be paid to the employee under the decree, award, or other valid order obtained by the employee after establishing his claim in that behalf. We are reluctant to accept the view that the legislature intended that the specified authority or the State Government should hold a larger enquiry into the merits of the employee's claim without conferring on the State Government or the specified authority the necessary powers in that behalf. In this connection, it would be relevant to Point out that in many cases some complicated questions of fact may arise when working journalists make claims for wages against their employers. It is not unlikely that the status of the working journalist, the nature of the office he holds and the class to which he belongs may themselves be matters of dispute between the parties and the decision of such disputed questions of fact may need thorough examination and a formal enquiry. If that be so it is not likely that the legislature could have intended that such complicated questions of fact should be dealt with in a summary enquiry indicated by** s. 17**."**

28. It is amply clear that the application was preferred by the petitioner for non-implementation of Majithia Wage Board implementation but the Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer, Solan zone while exercising the powers vested in him vide notification dated 18.10.2016 has referred the dispute under Section 17(2) to this Court. Now, if the above notification is perused, the same reads as under:

"**In exercise of powers conferred as sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Condition of Service) and**

Miscellaneous Act, 1955 (45 of 1955), the Governor of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to specify the Labour Officer of the Department of Labour and Employment, Himachal Pradesh as authority within their respective jurisdiction for the purpose of Section 17 of the Act ibid, with immediate effect."

There is nothing on record to remotely suggest that the powers were also conferred upon the Labour-*cum*-Conciliation Officer, Solan vide any notification issued by the Government to refer the matter to this Court even under Section 17(2) of the Act.

29. Now, the question which arises before this Court is as to whether the Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer, Solan was competent to refer the matter to this Court in view of notification dated 18.10.2016, as referred to supra under Section 17(2) of the Act. In this regard, it would be beneficial to refer to the judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay, Nagpur Bench, Nagpur in WP No. 6402 of 2019 dated 17.11.2022 case titled as **All India Reporter Private Limited, a Company incorporated and registered under the Companies Act having its registered office at Medows House, Nagindas Master Road, Fort, Mumbai – 400023 and its industrial establishment at Congress Nagar, Nagpur, through its Managing Director – Shri Sumant Widyadhar Chitaley (Original Party No.1) Vs. The State of Maharashtra, through the Secretary, Department of Industries, Energy and Labour, Mantralaya, Mumbai and anr.**

The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced as under:

"6] **In the light of the rival submissions, the question that deserves consideration is whether it is open for the State Government to delegate its power of referring a question arising under the Act of 1955 to any authority or whether such power has to be exercised by the State Government itself. To consider the said question, it would be necessary to refer to the provisions of Sections 17(1) and (2) of the Act of 1955, which read thus :**

> **"17. Recovery of money due from an employer.—(1) Where any amount is due under this Act to a newspaper employee from an employer, the newspaper employee himself, or any person authorised by him in writing in this behalf, or in the case of the death of the employee, any member of his family may, without prejudice to any other mode of recovery, make an application to the State Government for the recovery of the amount due to him, and if the State Government, or such authority, as the State Government may specify in this behalf, is satisfied that any amount is so due, it shall issue a certificate for that amount to the Collector, and the Collector shall proceed to recover that amount in the same manner as an arrear of land revenue. (2) If any question arises as to the amount due under this Act to a newspaper employee from his employer, the State Government may, on its own motion or upon application made to it, refer the question to any Labour Court constituted by it under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 or under any corresponding law relating to investigation and settlement of industrial disputes in force in the State and the said act or law shall have effect in relation to the Labour Court as if the question so referred were a matter referred to the Labour Court for adjudication under that Act or law."**

7]. A perusal of Section 17(1) of the Act of 1955 indicates that without prejudice to any other mode of recovery, it would be open for a newspaper employee to seek recovery of amount due to him by making an application to the State Government. On the State Government or such authority that the State

Government may satisfy in this behalf being satisfied that any amount is so due, a certificate for such amount can be issued to the Collector who can then proceed to recover that amount in the same manner as an arrear of land revenue. It is clear from the said provision that the State Government has been conferred the power of delegating the task of determining whether any amount is due as claimed by a newspaper employee. The State Government can either itself or through such authority as specified issue a certificate as provided. In contrast, when the provisions of Section 17(2) of the Act of 1955 are analyzed, it becomes clear that no such power of delegation has been conferred on the State Government. Thus, if any question arises as to the amount due under the Act of 1955, it is for the State Government either on its own motion or on upon an application made to it to refer the question to any Labour Court as permitted. In other words, the State Government has not been conferred any power to delegate the task of referring such question to any Labour Court. There is thus a clear distinction contained in the provisions of Sections 17(1) and 17(2) of the Act of 1955 inasmuch as the power of delegation conferred on the State Government under Section 17(1) is missing in Section 17(2) of the Act of 1955. In this regard, the learned Counsel for the petitioner is justified in relying upon the decision in M. Chandru (supra) wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed in clear terms that delegation of power is permissible if there exists such provision in the Principal Act. The power to delegate being a statutory requirement must find place in the Principal Act itself. It is thus clear that in the absence of any such power of delegation being conferred upon the State Government under Section 17(2) of the Act of 1955 to refer any question as to whether any amount is due under the Act of 1955 to a newspaper employee, such reference has to be made by the State Government itself.

8. ……..

9]. It was also submitted by the learned Counsel for the petitioner that since the members of the Union sought determination of their entitlement to higher wages, remedy under Section 17 of the Act of 1955 was not available. What was required to be resolved was an industrial dispute and therefore the members of the Union ought to have invoke appropriate jurisdiction in that regard. Reliance was placed on the decision in Sanjay Shalikram Ingle (supra). However, since it has been found that the Additional Commissioner of Labour was not empowered to make the reference under Section 17(2) of the Act of 1955 to the Labour Court, it would not be necessary at this stage to consider the said aspect of the matter. If a reference is made by the State Government under Section 17(2) of the Act of 1955, the said aspect can be considered at that stage".

30. This judgment was followed by the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay, Aurangabad Bench in case titled as **Head of Human Resources, Dainik Bhaskar Group Vs. Dinesh Devidas Pardeshi 2023 (177) FLR 2018**.

31. Thus, it is amply clear from the above judgments that powers under Section 17(2) of the Act cannot be delegated to the Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer, Solan to make a reference under Section 17(2) of the Act nor any such notification has been produced or brought to the notice of this Court that the Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer, Solan was authorized to make a reference to this Court even under Section 17(2) of the Act.

32. In view of the discussion made hereinabove, and in view of the ratio of judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Nagpur bench, followed by the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay

at Aurangabad Bench (supra), that the Government cannot delegate its powers under Section 17 (2) of the Act to any Labour Officer to file a reference in this regard before this Court. The reference, thus, which has been made to this Court is without any jurisdiction and the same is not maintainable.

33. The petitioner has also claimed that he was orally terminated from the service by the respondent without complying with the mandatory provisions of law despite the fact that he was selected as regular photo editor on monthly salary of ₹ 3500/-. It has further claimed that the respondents have also violated the principles of "last come first go" as junior to him were retained. However, in support of above claim the petitioner has not produced any appointment letter on record which could go to show that he had been selected as Photo Editor on regular basis. The petitioner though has claimed that he has completed 240 days in each calendar year but neither he has produced any appointment letter nor attendance/mandays chart on record. Ex. P-6 clearly establishes on record that petitioner was appointed as photographer on part time basis. There is nothing on record to substantiate the claim of the petitioner that he was engaged as full time photo-editor on regular basis. Moreover, the reference which has been sent to this Court is only whether the non-payment of wages as per recommendations of Majithia Wage Board constituted under Section 9 of the Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Condition of Services and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955) vide notification by the Centre Government to petitioner by the respondents is legal and justified.

34. There is no reference sent to this court about the alleged illegal termination of the petitioner by the respondent. It is well settled that this Court cannot go beyond the terms of reference and is bound to adjudicate the reference which has been sent to this Court. Since, no reference has been sent to this Court about the alleged illegal termination of the petitioner in violation of principles of "last come first go" as claimed by the petitioner, this Court cannot adjudicate any issue which has been raised by the petitioner in this regard for the first time in the claim petition. In view of above discussion, all these issues are decided accordingly in negative.

Issues No. 4.

35. To prove this issue no evidence has been led by the respondents which could go to show that as to how the petition is not maintainable and how petitioner is estopped to file the present claim on account of his own acts, deeds and acquiescence. In the absence of any evidence on record, this issue is decided against the respondents.

Relief.

36. In view of my findings on issues no.1 to 4, above, the claim filed by the petitioner fails and hereby dismissed. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms. Let a copy of this award be communicated to the Appropriate Government as well as to the Labour Officer, Solan zone for further action. The file after due completion be consigned to records.

Announced in the open Court today on this 29th Day of May, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Shimla (H.P.).

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA-171001
NOTIFICATION

Dated, the 1st August, 2025

No. HHC/Estt.7(35)/05-X.—In supersession of this Registry Notification No. HHC/Estt. 7(35)/05-IX-27796-98, dated 12/13-09-2024 and in exercise of powers conferred under Section 4(1)(b) of RTI Act, 2005, 17 points updated information under R.T.I. Act, is as under:

Disclosure under Section 4 of RTI Act, 2005:

(i) The particulars of its organization, functions and duties:

PARTICULARS OF HIGH COURT

The High Court of Himachal Pradesh has been established on 25th January, 1971. The present sanctioned strength of Hon'ble Judges, including Hon'ble the Chief Justice is Seventeen. However, at present, working strength of Hon'ble Judges including the Hon'ble Chief Justice is Eleven.

Sittings of the Court:

Court working hours are from 10.00 A.M. to 1.00 P.M. and 2.00 P.M. to 4.15 P.M. Saturdays are generally non-working days for Courts in the High Court, yet some of the Saturdays are declared as working days for the Courts.

Registry of High Court:

Except holidays, the Registry of the High Court remains open from 9.45 A.M. to 4.45 P.M. with half an hour lunch break from 1.30 P.M.to 2.00 P.M.

The Registry is headed by the Registrar General. It has been divided into following Branches/ Sections:—

1. Confidential Branch
2. Vigilance Branch & Inspection Branch
3. Rules Branch
4. Judicial Branch
5. Establishment Branch
6. GADB Branch
7. Organization and Administration Branch
8. Accounts Branch
9. Judges Branch
10. Protocol Branch

11. Computer Branch

12. Recruitmen Cell and

13. Library

In addition to Registrar General, there are Six other Registrars:

1. Registrar (Vigilance)

2. Registrar (Rules & Judges Branch)

3. Registrar (Judicial & Protocol)

4. Registrar (Admn., GAD&IT)

5. Registrar (Accounts)

6. Registrar (Establishment)

In addition to this, there is one post of District & Sessions Judge (Leave /Training Reserve), one post of Senior Civil Judge as Central Project Co-ordinator, one post of Senior Civil Judge (Leave/Training Reserve) and five posts of Civil Judge (Training/Leave Reserve) in the Registry.

Sanctioned Strength of Registry:

Sanctioned strength of Officers/Officials on the Establishment of the High Court Registry as on 01-06-2025, along with their pay scales is as follows: —

Sl. No.	Nomenclature of the Cadre	Total No. of sanctioned posts in the Cadre	Existing pay scale
1.	Registrar General	1	LevelJ-7 (₹ 199100-224100)
2.	Registrar (Vigilance)	1	LevelJ-6 (₹ 163030-219090)
3.	Registrar (Judicial)	1	LevelJ-6 (₹ 163030-219090)
4.	Registrar (Rules)	1	LevelJ-6 (₹ 163030-219090)
5.	Registrar (Administration)	1	LevelJ-5 (₹ 144840-194660)
6.	District & Sessions Judge (Leave/Training Reserve)	1	LevelJ-5 (₹ 144840-194660)
7.	Civil Judge (Senior Division) as C.P.C. of e-Courts Project.	1	LevelJ-4 (₹ 122700-180200)
8.	Civil Jud Leave/Training Reserve	1	LevelJ-3 (₹ 111000-163030)
9.	Civil Judge (Junior Division)	5	LevelJ-1 (₹ 77840-136520)
10.	Registrar (Establishment)	1	Level-27 (₹ 122800-209100)
11.	Registrar (Accounts)	1	Level-27 (₹ 122800-209100)

12.	Additional Registrars (The Honoble Chief Justice can post any one from amongst the Additional Registrars as Principal Private Secretary to Hon'ble the Chief Justice).	4	Level-26 (₹ 115000-207900)
13.	Deputy Registrars	6	Level-23 (₹ 83600-203100)
14.	Assistant Registrars	10	Level-21 (₹ 67400-201200)
15.	Court Masters	19	Level-21 (₹ 67400-201200)
16.	Secretaries	19	Level-21 (₹ 67400-201200)
17.	Court Secretary	1	Level-21 (₹ 67400-201200)
18.	Estate Officer	1	Level-16(₹ 48700-154300)
19.	Section Officer including one Leave Reserve Reader.	22	Level-16(₹ 48700-154300)
20.	Reader	4	Level-16(₹ 48700-154300)
21.	Private Secretaries	27	Level-16(₹ 48700-154300)
22.	Protocol Officer	1	Level-16(₹ 48700-154300)
23.	Public Relation Officer	1	Level-16(₹ 48700-154300)
24.	Chief Librarian	1	Level-17(₹ 53600-170100)
25.	Section Officer (SAS)	1	Level-16(₹ 48700-154300)
26.	Computer Programmer	1	Level-16(₹ 48700-154300)
27.	Court Managers	2	Level-16(₹ 48700-154300)
28.	Superintendent Grade-II	17	Level-12(₹ 43000-136000)
29.	Revisor	3	Level-12(₹ 43000-136000)
30.	Personal Assistant	4	Level-12(₹ 43000-136000)
31.	Judgment Writer	23	Level-12(₹ 43000-136000)
32.	Additional Protocol Officer	1	Level-12(₹ 43000-136000)
33.	Senior Assistant/Record Keeper/Reader to Registrar General/ Court Officer/Auditor Care Taker.	72	Level-11 (₹ 38500-122700)
34.	Translator	8	Level-11 (₹ 38500-122700)
35.	Senior Translator	1	Level-11 (₹ 38500-122700)
36.	Stenographer	12	Level-11 (₹ 38500-122700)
37.	Junior Scale Stenographer	5	Level-7(₹ 28900-91600)
38.	Librarian	2	Level-11(₹ 38500-122700)/ Level-9 (₹ 35600-112800)
39.	Assistant Programmer	12	Level-11 (₹ 38500-122700)
40.	Junior Assistants/Clerks/Proof Readers.	94	Level-7 (₹ 28900-91900) Level-3 (₹ 20200-64000)
41.	Assistant Librarian	1	Level-9 (₹ 35600-112800)
42.	Junior Office Assistant (including one post created under SCMS)	17	Level-4 (₹ 20600-65500)
43.	Receptionist	2	Level-3 (₹ 20200-64000)

44.	Telephone Operators	3	Level-6 (₹ 25600-81200)
45.	Restorer	21	Level-3 (₹ 20200-64000)
46.	Supervisory Driver	1	Level-6 (₹ 25600-81200)
47.	Drivers (including 4 posts of Leave Reserve).	30	Level-5 (₹ 21300-67800)
48.	Motor Mechanic	1	Level-6 (₹ 25600-81200)
49.	Junior Technical (Electrician)	1	Level-3 (₹ 20200-64000)
50.	Book Binders	1	Level-3 (₹ 20200-64000)
51.	Gestetnor Operators	4	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
52.	Daftries	4	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
53.	Court Jamadar	2	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
54.	Ushers	27	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
55.	Library Attendant	1	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
56.	Process Server	2	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
57.	Peons	92	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
58.	Peons (Co-terminus)	19	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
59.	Chowkidar	6	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
60.	Cook-*cum*-Chowkidar	1	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
61.	Cook-*cum*-Attendants	6	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
62.	Mali	12	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
63.	Frash	1	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
64.	Safai Karamchari	14	Level-1 (₹ 18000-56900)
65.	Data Entry Operator (on out source basis).	1	On fixed remuneration as fixed by State Govt. from time to time.

Note.—Besides above, the following posts also exist on the establishment of the High Court Registry.

1. Editor (ILR) and Assistant (ILR) are on fixed remuneration (two posts)

2. 14 posts of Law Clerks are on fixed remuneration of Rs. 25,000/ per month

Main Functions of the Organization:

1. Judicial; and

2. Administrative

(ii) Powers and duties of its officers and employees:

The Administrative and Executive business/work of the High Court Registry has been divided as per Notification No. HIC/Admn.1(18)/78-XV-20776-81, dated 09-08-2016, followed by

different orders issued in this behalf from time to time, which is available on the official website of the High Court.

Duties of Supervisory Officers:

The Supervisory Officers have to perform multifarious duties and functions.

Their main role is as under:

(i) To assist the authorities in decision making and formulation of plans and programs;

(ii) To present all cases, matters to the higher authorities in a precise manner with all possible solutions and suggestions;

(iii) To take effective steps for building up and maintaining all essential records;

(iv) To effectively supervise the work and conduct of all functionaries under them and be a source of guidance to lower functionaries in all official matters;

(v) To issue orders in accordance with the decisions of the competent authorities and under proper authentication.

Duties of Branch Officers and medium level Officers:

(i) To go through and initial with date the dak received by him and mark the papers to the concerned Section and also to give directions for its disposal whenever possible at the dak stage to enable speedy disposal;

(ii) To submit important communications to the superior officer at the dak stage for perusal and directions in case the same has not seen by the Officer;

(iii) To advise from time to time measures necessary for expeditious disposal of business/ work in a Section;

(iv) To keep a watch over timely submission/ receipt of returns/statements end to send the same to quarter concerned duly checked/scrutinized. Also, to ensure that all relevant acts, rules, manuals, instructions, Court files proceedings registers of the Department are kept up-dated;

(v) To train and guide the staff working under him and to point out their shortcomings and deficiencies, if any, and remedial action;

(vi) To keep him acquainted with the morale, conduct and discipline of the staff posted in Sections under him and to ensure punctuality in attendance by the staff posted in the Sections under his Charge.

Duties of Section Officer:

The Section Officer is normally in-charge of one Section and has generally to perform the following duties and functions:—

To go through the dak as received by him and take following steps:

1. mark the receipts to the concerned Sections;

2. submit the important communications for perusal of the higher authorities through Branch Officer at dak stage;

3. keep a check or note in the diary about important receipts or watching proper and timely disposal;

4. to see that all dealing hands and the diarist maintain all required registers and keep the same updated;

5. to prepare papers and compiled data for meetings and ensure timely submissions;

6. to ensure punctuality in attendance in a Section and to advice the staff on matters of conduct and discipline;

7. to ensure that the dealing hand maintain their assistant's diaries regularly and note the particulars of initial submissions of cases and also record final disposal of receipts at appropriate stage of final disposal of the cases.

On receiving back, the file with decision/orders of the competent authority, the draft is to be added by the dealing hands unless the Branch Officer/Supervisory Officer chooses to add the draft at his level. After the draft has been approved by the Branch Officer or the higher authority, the file is received back in the Section for typing fair copies of the draft. The fair copies duly compared and initialed by the official comparing the same are to be placed on the top of the file and sent to the appropriate authority for signatures and the fair copies after signatures are to be dispatched to the concerned quarter.

(iii) The procedure followed in the decision making process including channels of supervision and accountability:

In addition to the procedure maintained above, Chapter 8B of H.P. High Court (Scrutiny, Maintenance of Judicial Records, Administrative and Executive Business) Rules, 1997 is applicable, which read as under:—

INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING MAINTENANCE OF ADMINISTRATIVE FILES AND THE MANNER OF DEALING WITH ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:

1. The administrative and office files should in future be stitched after perforation of the file papers at two suitable points on the left side. The two holes in papers should be at appropriate places for stitching with fairly long tags.

2. The stitching of the new files should be so effected that the office noting and the file papers are not disturbed in any manner by the stitching holes. In order to achieve this end, two holes at the proper places should be made in all note sheets before they are brought in use. Sufficient margin should be left on both sides of the sheets so that the noting can be read without opening the tags of the files. New files should be opened in place of the old ones which have already grown bulky and the above instructions should be followed for maintaining the new files. Those files which are not bulky at the moment should be immediately converted into the new system by making two holes in all the papers. However, extreme care

should be taken that this process does not mutilate the existing notings. Where it is not possible to convert these files in the aforesaid manner, new files be opened.

3. It will be the personal responsibility of the Section Officer of the Branch concerned to ensure that the above instructions are effectively complied with by all Dealing Assistants.

[Office Order No. HHC/Admn.6(46)/78, dated April 6,1981]

4. The administrative records of the Registry must be properly maintained in a manner that they are readily available for reference in future.

5. As and when any communication/information is circulated to the Officers/Officials of the Registry or to the Subordinate Courts, the records showing such circulation must be maintained properly so that in future, a plea is not raised that such matter was not brought to the notice of a particular person or class.

6. As and when any information/communication is to be circulated to the Officers and Officials of the Registry, one copy thereof must be affixed on the Court Notice Board, unless otherwise directed.

[Office Order No. HHC/Estt.3(209)/84, dated January 9,1997]

7. The officers of the rank of Superintendent(s) (now Section Officers) and above will ensure that all Rules, instructions, guidelines and precedents relevant for consideration of the subject matters are clearly set out in the office notings before submission to the higher authorities and notes should be duly numbered.

[Office Order No. HHC/Admn.1(18)/78-V dated December 13,1996]

8. Ordinarily no communication/application representation/submission/file which is required to be put up before the Hon'ble the Chief Justice should take more than 15 days in any event from the date of the receipt/initiation. This is, however, the outer time limit and the processing period for each matter should depend upon the nature of case being dealt with.

9. The officer and official concerned with the receipt and opening of dak envelopes shall invariably open the envelope in such a manner that the postal seal, postal stamp and address of the sender and that of the addressee are not damaged in any manner.

10. The officer before whom dak is put up shall after going through the dak and taking into consideration its nature shall mark ‘P’ and ‘D’ on the margin of the letter with red ink. The letter ‘P’ denotes ‘preserve’ and letter ‘D’ denotes ‘destroy’.

11. The envelope of the letter on the margin of which ‘D’ is marked shall be destroyed after a month after obtaining the approval of the officer not below the rank of Addl. Registrar whereas the envelope of the letter on which ‘P’ is marked, shall be preserved for aperiod of one year or such further period as may be required. After the expiry of period of one year or the extended period the

envelope attached with the letter on which 'P' has been marked shall be destroyed.

[Office order No. HHC/Rules/Misc./1/96, dated April 23,1997]

12. The applications, on the administrative side, for adjournment of case which are not actual date cases and which are not included in the list, shall be presented personally to the Registrar High Court of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla, ordinarily at least three days before they are included in the list.

    In exceptional cases in unforeseen circumstances, such applications may be presented on a day before such date but by 11.00 A.M.

13. No application for adjournment of 'actual date' cases which are to be included in the list, shall be presented to and entertained by the Registrar unless consent thereto is given by the opposite party(s).

14. After receipt of the application, the Registrar will place the application before the Hon'ble the Chief Justice for orders.

    (D.O. No. HHC/Judl/INST/11-3-96, dated March 25,1997).

(iv) The norms set for discharge of functions by the Officers/Officials of the Registry for the speedy delivery of justice system etc.:

There are various rules and instructions for the smooth functioning of the justice delivery system and in this regard various circulars orders have been issued from time to time by the High Court of Himachal Pradesh and which have been circulated in two volumes +Volume-III of Vigilance Branch.

(v) The rules, regulations, instructions, manual and records held by it or under its control or used by its employees for discharging its functions:

Rules have been framed by the High Court which are available on the website of the High court of Himachal Pradesh. The High Court is following Fundamental Rules and Supplementary Rules.

(vi) A statement of the categories of documents that are held by Registry or under its control:

The High Court is in the process of digitization of the documents. Some of the Branches *i.e.* Accounts, Rules and Establishment are still maintaining the documents in the form of registers/file etc.

(vii) The particulars of arrangement that exists for consultation and representation by the member of the public in relation to the formulation of its policy or implementation thereof:

Any person from the public can report regarding grievances/suggestions with respect to the functioning of the High Court/Subordinate Courts by visiting Web Portal titled "Grievances/Suggestions" on the official Website of the High Court.

(viii) A statement of the boards, councils, committees and other bodies consisting of two or more persons constituted as its part or for the purpose of its advice,

and as to whether meetings of those boards, councils, committees and other bodies are open to the public, or the minutes of such meetings are accessible for public:

The public is not authorized to have access of the following documents:—

(i) The Judges Notes and Minutes,

(ii) Correspondence which is not strictly judicial; and

(iii) Confidential correspondence

(ix) A directory of the Officers/staff of the High Court:

The telephone directory of officers/staff is already on the High Court Website.

(x) The monthly remuneration received by each of its officers and employees, including the system of compensation as provided in its regulations:

In general, there is no monthly remuneration fixed for its employees, except, the Law Clerks and Editors (ILR). There is also no system of compensations etc. provided in the regulations.

(xi) The budget allocated to each of its agency, indicating the particulars of all plans, proposed expenditure and reports on disbursements made as follows:

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme(s)/agency	Budget allocated for the financial year 2024-25 (Final figures) *i.e.* additionality + funds surrendered)	Expenditure during the previous Financial year 2024-25 (*w.e.f.*) 01-04-2024 to 31-03-2025)
1	2	3	4
1.	Major Head 2014-Admn. of Justice, 102-High Court, 01-High Court Establishment (Charged)-SOON, Demand No.3.	Rs. 67,32,26,884.00	Rs. 67,28,45,140.00
2.	Major Head 2014-Admn. of Justice, 102-High Court, 01-High Court Establishment (Voted)-SOON, Demand No.3.	Rs. 42,15,000.00	Rs. 42,11,377.00
3.	Major Head 2014 Admn. of Justice, 105-Civil & Sessions Court, 01-Civil & Sessions Court Establishment (Voted) SOON, Demand No.3.	Rs. 226,96,64,328.00	Rs. 224,66,86,008.00
4.	Major Head 2014-Admn. of Justice,108 Criminal Courts, 01-Road & Diet Money to witnesses (Voted)-SOON, Demand No.3.	Rs. 2,00,00,000.00	Rs. 2,00,00,000.00
5.	Major Head 2014-Admn. of Justice, 796-Tribal Area Development Programme (TADP), 01-expenditure on Civil & Sessions Court Establishment (Voted)-SOON, Demand No.31.	Rs. 3,75,06,000.00	Rs. 3,50,45,509.00
6.	Major Head 2014-Admn. of Justice, 796-02 Expenditure on witness and Diet Money (Voted)-SOON, Demand No.31.	Rs. 5,50,000.00	Rs. 5,50,000.00

7.	Major Head 2235, Social Security & Welfare, 800 Other Charges, 38, Medical Re-imbursement of Pensioners and Other Charges, High Court and District Judiciary (Voted)-SOON, Demand No.19.	Rs. 2,72,28,000.00	Rs. 2,72,27,824.00
8.	2014-00-105-07-C90N-Voted Demand No. 3 Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs) under POCSO Act/Scheme.	Rs. 2,38,04,000.00	Rs.2,25,31,005.00
9.	2014-00-105-07-S10N-Voted Demand No. 3 Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs) under POCSO Act/Scheme.	Rs. 18,26,000.00	Rs.15,28,282.00
10	2014-00-105-07-SOON-Voted Demand No. 3 Fast Track Special Courts (FTSCs) under POCSO Act/Scheme.	Rs.1,86,62,174.00	Rs.1,86,62,174.00
Note.—The accounts/figures for the month of March, 2025 are yet to be finalized/complied by the o/o the Accountant General (A & E) H.P., as such; only tentative figures with regard to expenditure under different HOA(s), Asper the status of Treasurer. Accounts & Lottery Department H.P. has been made available.			

In addition to the aforesaid information, the detailed particulars of Schemes/Agency with regard to the updated expenditure *disbursement* as *SOE* component-wise can be checked online through the Government Website portal *i.e.* Himkosh (https://himkosh. nic.in/ eHPOLTlS/PublicReports/wfrmHODAIlocaticn.aspx).

Information Regarding funds allocated to the Judicial Infrastructure during FY 2023-24 as on 31-03-2024

Sl. No.	Head of Account	Funds allocated (in lacs)	Funds surrendered (in lacs)	funds re-appropriated (in lacs)
Demand No. 03				
1.	4059-01-053-38-SOON Maintenance of High Court and Subordinate Court Buildings 25-Maintenance.	233.37	0.00	0.00
2.	2216-05-053-01-SOON Maintenance of General Pool Accommodation 21-Maintenance.	240.58	0.00	0.00
3.	4059-01-051-15-C90N Central share for Up-gradation of Judiciary Infrastructure-37-Major Works.	1362.00	0.00	0.00
4.	4059-01-051-15-S10N State Share for Up-gradation of Judiciary Infrastructure-37-Major Works.	151.22	0.00	0.00
5.	4059-01-051-15-SOON Up-gradation of Judiciary Infrastructure-37-Major Works.	115.00	0.00	0.00
6.	4059-01-051-15-SOON Up-gradation of Judiciary Infrastructure-37 Major Works (Charged).	478.81	0.00	0.00

Demand No. 31				
1.	4059-01-796-05-C90N- Central Share 90% for Exp. on Judiciary Infrastructure-37-Major Works.	0.00	0.00	0.00
2.	4059-01-796-05-S10N- Share for expenditure on Judiciary Infrastructure 37-Major Works.	0.00	0.00	0.00
3.	4059-01-796-05-SOON Upgradation of Judiciary Infrastructure 37-Major Works.	0.00	0.00	0.00
Demand No. 32				
1.	4059-01-789-02-C90N (Central Share 90%)-37-Major Works.	1.00	0.00	0.00
2.	4059-01-789-02-S10N State Share for Upgradation of Judiciary 37-Major Works.	1.00	0.00	0.00
3.	4059-01-789-02-SOON Upgradation of Judiciary 37-Major Works.	3.00	0.00	0.00
	Grand Total	**2585.98**	**0.00**	**0.00**

(xii) The manner of execution of subsidy programmes, including the amounts allocated and the details of beneficiaries of such programmes:

Not applicable in case of the Registry of this High Court.

(xiii)Particulars of recipients, of concessions, permits of authorizations granted by the High Court:

Not applicable to the Registry of this High Court.

(xiv)Details in respect of the information, available to or held by the High Court, reduced in an electronic form:

The history of High Court, Administrative set-up, title of Rules, case, status, cause list, legal aid, telephone directory, calendar, the profiles of serving Chief Justice, Judges, former Chief Justice sand former Judges have been updated on the High Court website and same are accessible at the following address:

Website Address : http://hphighcourt.nic.in

E-Mail Address : hicourt-hp@nic.in

(xv)The particulars of facilities available to citizens for obtaining information, including the working hours of a library or reading room, if maintained for public use:

The working hours of the Library of the Hon'ble High Court are 9.45A.M. to 4.45 P.M. It is Hon'ble Judges 'Library and it is not allowed for general public'.

(xvi)The names, designations and other particulars of the Public Information Officers:

Hon'ble the Chief Justice has been pleased to designate the following Officers as:—

1. State Public Information Officers at the High Court and the District Levels to provide information in accordance with the provisions of the R.T. Act and the Rules framed there-under; and

2. State Assistant Public Information Officers at the sub-divisional level to perform the duties envisaged and entrusted to them, under sub-section (2) of Section 5 of the aforesaid Act.

1. Smt. Urmila, Deputy Registrar is the State Public Information Offices at High Court level.

2. State Public Information Officer is Senior Civil Judge at District level of the concerned District.

3. Assistant State Public Information Officer is Civil Judge, Court No.1 at Sub-Divisional Head quarters where there are more than one Court and the Civil Judge posted at Sub Divisional Headquarters where there is only one Court.

It is further notified that for the purpose of filing appeals against the decisions of State Public Information Officers as provided under Section 19(1) of the aforesaid Act, the Registrar (Vigilance) at High Court and in the Districts, the District and Sessions Judge of the concerned District would be the competent authority.

(xvii) Such other information as may be prescribed;

Facilities available in High Court:—

(i) Dispensary;

(ii) Canteen;

(iii) Post Office;

(iv) Bank;

(v) Mediation Centre;

(vi) Auditorium; and

(vii) Creche

Dispensary:

A Primary Health Centre is functioning in the High Court Complex (old building). One Physician is available in the dispensary during office hours.

Canteen facilities:

Canteen for advocates, litigant public and staff of the High Court is functioning in the High Court.

Post Office:

A post office is functioning in the Additional Complex of High Court and is being used also by outside agencies and general public.

Bank:

A branch of UCO Bank is functioning in the High Court since 2003 and provides services including ATM facility to all its account holders and those desirous of transacting through the Bank.

Committees:

Different Committees comprising of Hon'ble the Chief Justice and Hon'ble Judges are functioning at the moment for carrying out various administrative functions etc., notification regarding which is available on the official website of High Court of Himachal Pradesh.

विधि विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला–2 13 अगस्त, 2025

संख्या एल0एल0आर0–डी0(6)–13 / 2025–लेज.––हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल ने भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 213 (1) के अधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए हिमाचल प्रदेश नगरपालिका (संशोधन) अध्यादेश, 2025 को दिनांक 01–08–2025 को प्रख्यापित कर दिया है तथा अनुच्छेद 348 के खण्ड (3) के अधीन, अध्यादेश के अंग्रेजी पाठ को राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत कर दिया है। अतः उपरोक्त अध्यादेश को वर्ष 2025 के अध्यादेश संख्यांक 3 के रूप में अंग्रेजी प्राधिकृत पाठ सहित राजपत्र (ई–गजट) हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशित किया जाता है।

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित / –
(शरद कुमार लगवाल),
प्रधान सचिव (विधि)।

2025 का हिमाचल प्रदेश अध्यादेश संख्यांक 3

हिमाचल प्रदेश नगरपालिका (संशोधन) अध्यादेश, 2025

भारत गणराज्य के छिहत्तरवें वर्ष में हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल द्वारा प्रख्यापित

हिमाचल प्रदेश नगरपालिका अधिनियम, 1994 (1994 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 13) का और संशोधन करने के लिए **अध्यादेश।**

हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा सत्र में नहीं है और हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल का यह समाधान हो गया है कि ऐसी परिस्थितियां विद्यमान हैं जिनके कारण उनके लिए तुरन्त कार्रवाई करना आवश्यक हो गया है;

अतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, भारत के संविधान के अनुच्छेद 213 के खण्ड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निम्नलिखित अध्यादेश प्रख्यापित करते हैं:–

1. **संक्षिप्त नाम.**––इस अध्यादेश का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश नगरपालिका (संशोधन) अध्यादेश, 2025 है।

2. **धारा 14 का संशोधन.**––हिमाचल प्रदेश नगरपालिका अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 14 की उप–धारा (2) के द्वितीय परन्तुक के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:–

''परन्तु यह और कि हिमाचल प्रदेश नगरपालिका (द्वितीय संशोधन) अधिनियम, 2003 के प्रारम्भ के पश्चात् नगरपालिका का प्रथम निर्वाचन, उसके नगरपालिका के रूप में अधिसूचित किए जाने के दो वर्ष की अवधि के भीतर करवाया जा सकेगा।''।

(शिव प्रताप शुक्ल),
राज्यपाल,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।

———————

(शरद कुमार लगवाल),
प्रधान सचिव (विधि)।

शिमला :

तारीख : 13 अगस्त, 2025.

———————

AUTHORITATIVE ENGLISH TEXT

H.P. Ordinance No. 3 of 2025.

THE HIMACHAL PRADESH MUNICIPAL (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 2025

Promulgated by the Governor of Himachal Pradesh in the Seventy-sixth Year of the Republic of India.

AN ORDINANCE further to amend the Himachal Municipal Act, 1994 (Act No. 13 of 1994).

WHEREAS, the Legislative Assembly of Himachal Pradesh is not in session and the Governor of Himachal Pradesh is satisfied that circumstances exist which render it necessary for him take immediate action;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (1) of article 213 of the Constitution of India, the Governor of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to promulgate the following Ordinance:—

1. Short title.—This Ordinance may be called the Himachal Pradesh Municipal (Amendment) Ordinance, 2025.

2. Amendment of section 14.—In section 14 of the Himachal Pradesh Municipal Act, 1994, (Act No. 13 of 1994), in sub-section (2), for the second proviso, the following proviso shall be substituted, namely:—

"Provided further that the first election to a municipality after the commencement of the Himachal Pradesh Municipal (Second Amendment) Act, 2003, may be held within a period of two years of its being notified as a municipality.".

(SHIV PRATAP SHUKLA),
Governor,
Himachal Pradesh.

(SHARAD KUMAR LAGWAL),
Principal Secretary(Law).

SHIMLA :

Dated : 13th August, 2025.

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Gian Singh s/o Late Sh. Gambhir Singh, r/o Village Ropa, Tehsil Pooh, Distt. Kinnaur (H.P.) declare that in my son's Aditya Singh 10th Marksheet Roll No. 17283647 (CBSE-2024) my name is wrongly entered as Gain Singh which should be corrected as Gian Singh.

GIAN SINGH
s/o Late Sh. Gambhir Singh,
r/o Village Ropa,
Tehsil Pooh, Distt. Kinnaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Ghanshyam Dass declare that I have changed the name of my son from Ujjaval Thakur to Ujjwal Thakur, r/o Seri, Katanda, P.O. Mahog, Tehsil Karsog, Distt. Mandi (H.P.) for all future purposes.

GHANSHYAM DASS
r/o Seri, Katanda, P.O. Mahog,
Tehsil Karsog, Distt. Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Meenakshi w/o Sh. Ajay Kumar aged about 39 years, r/o Ward No. 3, Near Old Bus Stand Nalagarh, Tehsil Nalagarh, Distt. Solan (H.P.) declare that I have changed the name of my daughter Andesha (Aadhar Number 4477 7019 1073) to Anvesha. All concerned please may note.

MEENAKSHI
w/o Sh. Ajay Kumar,
r/o Ward No. 3, Near Old Bus Stand Nalagarh,
Tehsil Nalagarh, Distt. Solan (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Geeta Devi w/o Sh. Sandeep Sharma, r/o Village Rivari, P.O. Dalash, Tehsil Anni, Distt. Kullu (H.P.)-172 025 declare that I have changed my name from Bhoga Devi to Geeta Devi. All concerned please may note.

GEETA DEVI
w/o Sh. Sandeep Sharma,
r/o Village Rivari, P.O. Dalash,
Tehsil Anni, Distt. Kullu (H.P.)-172 025.

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Nand Singh s/o Rattan Singh, r/o Village Kapahari, P.O. Haral, Tehsil Nurpur, District Kangra (H.P.) declare that in my son's Aadhar Card the spelling of his name is wrongly written as Thakur Bhawani Singh. Correct spelling of my son is Thakur Bhwani Singh.

NAND SINGH
s/o Rattan Singh,
r/o Village Kapahari, P.O. Haral,
Tehsil Nurpur, District Kangra (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Balbir Singh s/o Sh. Madan Singh, r/o Village Dharwa, P.O. Jhakando, Tehsil Shillai, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.) declare that in Aadhar card of my son his name is wrongly entered as Bansh Thakur, whereas his correct name is Ansh Thakur. Please note.

BALBIR SINGH
s/o Sh. Madan Singh,
r/o Village Dharwa, P.O. Jhakando,
Tehsil Shillai, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Ramesh Kumar s/o Late Sh. Hem Raj, r/o Village Sainj (216), P.O. Pandoa, Tehsil Sunni, Distt. Shimla (H.P.)-171 019 declare that my daughter's name has been wrongly entered in her Aadhar Card No. 2488 4304 6408 records as Mitai instead of Mitali. Orginal name is Mitali may kindly be corrected/entered in her Aadhar Card No. 2488 4304 6408 records. All concerned please may note.

RAMESH KUMAR
s/o Late Sh. Hem Raj,
r/o Village Sainj (216), P.O. Pandoa,
Tehsil Sunni, Distt. Shimla (H.P.)-171 019.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Mahender Kumar s/o Sh. Lekh Ram, r/o Raghunath Villa Jakhoo, Shimla (H.P.)- 171 001 declare that I have changed my name from Mahender to Mahender Kumar. All concerned please may note.

MAHENDER KUMAR
s/o Sh. Lekh Ram,
r/o Raghunath Villa Jakhoo,
Shimla (H.P.)-171 001.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Meena Sharma w/o Sh. Mahender Kumar, r/o Raghunath Villa Jakhoo, Shimla (H.P.)-171 001 declare that I have changed my name from Meena to Meena Sharma. All concerned please may note.

MEENA SHARMA
w/o Sh. Mahender Kumar,
r/o Raghunath Villa Jakhoo,
Shimla (H.P.)-171 001.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Parshotam Lal (New Name) s/o Braham Dass, r/o Village Naroh, P.O. Bahanwin, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Purshottam Lal Sharma (Previous Name) to Parshotam Lal (New Name) in my Aadhar Card records. All concerned please may note.

PARSHOTAM LAL
s/o Braham Dass,
r/o Village Naroh, P.O. Bahanwin,
Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Shimla (R), District Shimla (H.P.)

Sh. Rajinder Kumar s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Village Bihar, P.O. Rajhana, Tehsil & District Shimla, H.P.

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

Whereas, Sh. Rajinder Kumar s/o Sh. Khushi Ram, r/o Village Bihar, P.O. Rajhana, Tehsil & District Shimla, H.P. has submitted an application along with Non-Availability Certificate issued by the Registrar, Birth & Death Gram Panchayat Rajhana Badai, Shimla (H.P.) in the court of undersigned under section 13(3) of the Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 to enter date of birth of himself Rajinder as 29-01-1969 in the record of Registrar, Birth and Death, in Gram Panchayat Rajhana Badai, Shimla, H.P. details are as under :

Sl. No.	Name of the family member	Relation	Date of Birth
1.	Rajinder Kumar	Self	29-01-1969

Hence, this proclamation is issued to the general public with directions that if any one has any objection/claim regarding entry of date of birth of above named person in the record of Registrar, Birth & Death Gram Panchayat Rajhana Badai, Shimla (H.P.) he/she may file their claims/objections in the court on or before one month of publication of this notice in Govt. Gazette, failing which necessary orders will be passed.

Issued today on 12-08-2025 under my signature and seal of the court.

Seal.

Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Shimla (R), District Shimla (H.P.).

नियन्त्रक, मुद्रण तथा लेखन सामग्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला–5 द्वारा मुद्रित तथा प्रकाशित
इलेक्ट्रॉनिक हस्ताक्षरित राजपत्र, वैबसाइट http://rajpatrahimachal.nic.in पर उपलब्ध हैए वम् ऑनलाइन सत्यापित किया जा सकता है।